

Trio Heard in Cigarette Suit

No Causal Relationship
Seen by Doctors

Three more witnesses called by tobacco companies Monday in defense of the cigarette-cancer case being tried in federal court testified that they see no causal relationship between smoking and lung cancer.

All three of the experts also told the court and jury that they believe that the increased incidence of lung cancer is due to a great extent to improved diagnosis and the increased human life span.

Those who testified Monday included Dr. Harry S. M. Green, professor of pathology at Yale university school of medicine; Dr. Douglas Sprunt, professor of pathology at the University of Tennessee; and Dr. William M. Tuttle, clinical professor of surgery at Wayne State university and a staff member at a number of Detroit hospitals.

Dr. Green testified, under cross-examination by Melvin M. Belli, an attorney for the plaintiff, that he smokes whenever he wants to and feels that smoking is an aid when he has a chest cold.

He said that when he has a chest cold he smokes and feels that it brings about "a productive cough" and relieves the pain in his chest.

After being read a medical history of Frank J. Lartigue, whose death from lung cancer in 1955 is at issue in the suit, Dr. Green said that he did not consider Lartigue's smoking a cause of his cancer, but testified that he was interested in the fact that the man had tuberculosis and influenza during his lifetime.

SEES POSSIBLE ASSOCIATION

He said that an association has been established between the incidence of tuberculosis and influenza and the incidence of lung cancer.

Under direct examination by Frederick Haas, a tobacco company attorney, Dr. Green told the court that he could not say with medical certainty that smoking is "the" cause, "a" cause, a "probable" cause, or a "contributing" cause of lung cancer.

As a basis for his opinion, the witness denied that there has been any definite proof that there is an increase in the incidence of lung cancer. "We do not know what the incidence of lung cancer was 20 years ago. We did not know what lung cancer was. We do not have any good base line to determine if there has been any increase in the incidence," he asserted.

He explained that all hospi-

tals have chest clinics now and patients are subjected to X-rays and other examinations, "so if we have a lung cancer it is recognized now when in the past it went unrecognized or misdiagnosed."

Dr. Green added that there has been an increase in the population at the age level where lung cancer is most prevalent.

On cross examination he also said that he does not think that there is enough evidence in either cases of tuberculosis, influenza, or smoking to point the finger of guilt.

He again denied that there is evidence of an increase in the incidence of lung cancer and said that if there is it could be related to the 1918 influenza epidemic.

Asked by Belli if there is anything in the medical literature relating to studies of the relationship of tuberculosis or influenza to lung cancer, the witness answered that there is not.

DENIES PREJUDICE AGAINST STATISTICS

Dr. Green denied having a prejudice against statistics and was asked by Belli if he had not testified before a committee of Congress "that you had as much use for statistics as you did for the Buddhist religion." The witness said, "I doubt if I said that."

The plaintiff's attorney then read from what was purported to be a transcript of the congressional hearing and quoted the doctor as saying "I am sorry to say, I have little faith in statistics. As a result of that study I have far less faith in statistics than I have in the tenets of the Buddhist religion."

Dr. Green said that if he finds a statistical relationship in medicine he then goes into the laboratory to verify it.

Belli brought out that Dr. Green had written a foreword for a book entitled "Science Looks at Smoking," and claimed that the book was distributed by a public relations firm representing the Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company, one of the defendants in the case.

Haas told the court that the firm was not employed by Liggett and Myers.

The second witness of the day was Dr. Sprunt. He testified that he has conducted studies to evaluate the present cancer tests and has been particularly active in the field of cancer of the cervix, which he said is essentially similar to cancer of the lung.

He said that he did not consider certain tissue changes as "pre-cancerous" changes because frequently these changes reverse themselves and the tis-

sues revert to normal. He said that the causes of these changes are not known.

Dr. Sprunt said that he has autopsied 4000 human lungs during the past five years in an effort to find tissue changes similar to those in the cervix. He said that he is also interested in the relationship of infectious diseases to cancer of the lung.

DENIES LUNG CANCER, SMOKING LINKED

Dr. Sprunt also denied that Lartigue's cancer had any connection with his smoking of over two packages of cigarettes a day or that the data available links smoking and lung cancer.

He pointed to the improvement in the diagnosis of lung cancer and claimed that the statistical association of lung cancer and smoking may be a "happencstance."

Smokers who have lung cancer, he asserted, "also have other factors in their histories." He claimed that statistics also show an association with tuberculosis and that syphilis has been associated with cancer of the larynx. The causation of cancer is still unknown, he said.

Cross examined by H. Alva Brumfield, another attorney for the plaintiff, Dr. Sprunt claimed that the statistical association of smoking with lung cancer is "rather low." He said that the medical articles he has written and which have been published deal with cancer of the cervix. He said that he has done no experimental work in the field of cancer of the lung and none of his articles has been on that subject.

Dr. Tuttle, under direct examination by Theodore Kiendl, another defense attorney, as to his qualifications, said that he has written over 75 articles in scientific and medical journals and seen 6000 lung cancer patients in the past 10 years, 50 per cent of which were inoperable.

Questioned by Belli, he said that none of these articles were on the effects of smoking or tobacco tars.

He said that about 15 per cent of those patients he has seen with lung cancer were non-smokers.

RATIO OF MALES WIDENING, CLAIM

Dr. Tuttle expressed the conviction that most lung cancer originates in the outer or peripheral portion of the lung and then spreads to the bronchial tubes.

He also claimed that the present ratio of 11 males who get lung cancer to one woman is widening and that more males are getting cancer and fewer females. In the group he operated on, he said, the female smokers were few.

Dr. Tuttle testified that he feels that "you can rub or paint a mouse with anything and it will get cancer." He made that statement after he was questioned by Kiendl about animal experimentation which has pro-

duced cancers in laboratory mice. These experiments, he said, cannot be extrapolated to humans.

He called animal experiments "greatly overdone." The doctor said: "They lather those mice every day with those tars and then they say 'see, here's the cancer.' That does not prove that the materials are carcinogenic to men."

Denying that Lartigue's cancer was due to smoking, he said: "There has been a great hullabaloo about smoking and cancer and nothing has been proved."

He claimed that when a person inhales cigarette smoke, the greatest concentration of tars is in the upper part of the respiratory area, so there should be a distinct rise in the incidence of cancer of the trachea. Actually, he asserted, he has seen only four such cases.

"They have gone about this thing in the wrong way. They have sort of put the cart before the horse and come up with the idea that cancer of the lung is caused by smoking, etc., etc.," he asserted.

The statisticians have started out to prove something, he charged.

Of those persons he has operated on for lung cancer, the doctor said, 75 per cent were over 65 years old.

Asked on cross examination by Belli if he had taken into account a statement made by the surgeon general of the United States regarding the relationship of lung cancer and smoking when he formed his opinions and when he termed the discussion about the relationship a "hullabaloo," the witness stated that the "hullabaloo" was raised before that statement was made.

Dr. Tuttle said that the surgeon general is not a clinician and that his report on the relationship was taken from an article "some boy worked up and he put his name on it."

Asked by Belli if he knew the name of the surgeon general, Dr. Tuttle replied "Berry, something like that."

The plaintiff's attorney stated for the record that the surgeon general's name is Burney.

With regard to the animal experiments, Dr. Tuttle claimed that mice are highly susceptible and "you can put almost anything on them and get cancer."

The suit, in its third week of trial, was brought by Mrs. Victoria S. Pierre Lartigue, whose husband died of cancer. She is suing Liggett and Myers and the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company for \$150,000.

THE TIMES-PICAYUNE
New Orleans, Louisiana
October 4, 1960

1003543371